THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

July 24, 1979

AM
10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings: August (undetermined)
September 20, 1979
October 23, 1979

B. Approval of June 28, 1979 minutes.

C. Publication in Federal Register of Proposed Rules and Regulations for the Commission of Fine Arts, July 20, 1979.

D. Keith-Albee Building. Status of Razing.

E. Georgetown Board Membership: Resignation of Ms. Anne Vytlacil.

F. Georgetown Waterfront Development. Status report.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of State

1. International Chancery Center Project, Bahrain Chancery, Lot # 7.

B. Department of the Navy

1. Chesapeake Division: Isaac Hull Gate, Washington Navy Yard.

2. Chesapeake Division: Military Vehicle Parking Area, Armed Forces Reserve Complex, Anacostia Headquarters, Naval District Building.

C. Office of Personnel Management,formerly the Civil Service Commission.

1. Proposed seal design.

D. District of Columbia Government

1. Department of General Services, Material samples for previously approved Civic Center, Mount Vernon Square.

E. District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 79-68, 69, 70, 2425 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Three proposed signs, Mclaughlen National Bank.

b. S.L. 79-78, 79, 2500 Calvert Street, N.W. New residential complex on Shoreham Americana grounds, demolition of existing hotel addition.

c. S.L. 79-80, 1919 F Street, N.W. New office building for the World Bank.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 79-113, 3045 K Street, N.W. Reconsider razing building under provisions of D.C. Historic Preservation and Historic District Act of 1978

b. O.G. 79-117, 2831 M Street, N.W. Proposed demolition of fire damaged gas station building.

c. O.G. 79-118, 2831 M Street, N.W. Proposed new office/apartment/retail building.

d. O.G. 79-121, 1232 31st Street, N.W. Building renovation, confirmation of permit approval as required by D.C. Historic Preservation and Historic District Act of 1978.

e. O.G. 79-126, 3277M Street, N.W. New Residential/retail complex, revisions to approved designs.

f. Appendix 1.

III. LEGISLATION

A. S.J. Resolution #64. To authorize the U.S. Navy Memorial Foundation to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or Potomac River environs.

B. S.J. Resolution #83. To authorize the Campfire Girls of Cundys Harbor, Maine, to erect a memorial on Maine Avenue in the District of Columbia.

C. S. 461, "The Architectural Excellence Act of 1979." To require that competitions be conducted to enhance the Nation's architecture and determine the design of certain new Federal office buildings. Report requested by the Office of Management and Budget.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

July 24, 1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 79-72 HPA. 79-291	3256 N Street, N.W. Jerome S. Wagshal	Installation of storm windows on all outside windows of the property. The following are attached: 2 pictures of building, 2 pictures of sample window, 4 pictures of storm windows to be installed.

ACTION: No objection to storm windows as long as existing window architraves and other details around the window enframent are not covered or damaged.

O.G. 79-110 HPA. 79-237	2823 N Street, N.W. Dr. & Mrs. Tom Bryant	Install five new skylights, new kitchen layout, renovate three existing baths, frame up four new closets and laundry room.

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 79-111 HPA. 79-249	3509 M Street, N.W. Grover Carey	Enclose existing porch, no increase in size, no change to existing roof.

ACTION: Issue permit. Recommend that horizontal mullion be raised to level of handrail, as noted on drawing.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

July 24, 1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 79-115 HPA. 79-281	3042 Cambridge Place, N.W. David and Lena Gill	Convert basement apartment into part of house. Put in inside central stairs. Remove present first floor porch and basement bath under porch. Convert from oil to gas broiler. Reduce size of heating room. Small landing and stairs in garden down from first floor.

ACTION: Issue permit. Recommend that 2 over 2 double-hung sash be used for basement windows in conformance with remaining original windows, as noted on drawings.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

24 JULY 1979

The meeting convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Philip W. Buchen Hon. Victorine DuPont Homsey Hon. Eli S. Jacobs Hon. Frederick D. Nichols Hon. Edward D. Stone, Jr.
Georgetown Board Member Present:	Ms. Anne Vytlacil
Staff Present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mrs. Elizabeth Bemis Mrs. Sue Kohler Miss Karen O'Meara Mr. John Vaughan

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 20 September 1979
23 October 1979
(28 August - if necessary)

B. Minutes of 28 June meeting, approved.

C. Publication in Federal Register of Proposed Rules and Regulations for the Commission of Fine Arts, 20 July 1979. The Secretary noted that the rules, as drawn up by Mr. Buchen, have been printed in the Federal Register. Mr. Buchen said that changes are still possible as there is a 60 day waiting period

during which comments and suggestions may be made before final printing. Since the previous meeting one change has been made: a clause added placing partial demolition of a building in the Commission's jurisdiction under the Shipstead-Luce Act.

D. Keith-Albee Building: Status of razing. The Secretary reported that the District Government's offer of 1 1/4 million dollars from both local and federal sources to subsidize the retention of the 15th Street facade of this building still stands, but as yet has been neither accepted or rejected by the developer, Oliver T. Carr. Since $800,000 would come from a DOI grant, a District official has urged the Commission of Fine Arts to write a letter to the Secretary of the Interior urging that these funds be made available as soon as possible. In response to a question by Mr. Buchen, the Secretary said the District Government's offer applied only to the Keith-Albee building. The developer plans to keep the facade of the Metropolitan Bank Building and has offered $100,000 to move the Rhodes Tavern off the site. Mrs. Homsey and Mr. Buchen asked what the sentiment was towards moving the building; the Secretary said the committee to preserve the tavern is opposed, feeling it would have no significance whatsoever on a different site.

E. Georgetown Board membership: Resignation of Ms. Anne Vytlacil. The Secretary announced that Ms. Vytlacil is resigning to accept a teaching position in California. He proposed that Mr. David Yerkes be approved as her replacement, and suggested that he be given a full three year term so that the terms of all three members will not expire in close succession. The Commission approved Mr. Yerkes appointment and his three year term, and Mr. Buchen suggested that the other members' terms be adjusted so that the expiration dates are staggered.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of State

1. International Chancery Center: Bahrain Chancery, Lot #7. The Assistant Secretary showed the members a model for this building and remarked that the design has been somewhat altered since the model was built, in favor of a more natural accommodation to the landscape in the rear. These changes, which were reflected in the drawings which accompanied the model, were made after the Planning Commission and the State Department re-studied the master plan (as requested by Mr. Stone) and determined that lot coverage guidelines had been misinterpreted in the chancery program to date.

Mr. George Sealey from the State Department introduced architect Gregory Downes from The Architects' Collaborative in Boston, and Timothy Coppola, landscape architect. Mr. Downes explained the changes that had been made, pointing out on the model a series of built-up terraces at the rear which have been replaced by a cantilevered balcony, allowing the steep hillside to remain in its natural state. He said the terrace plan with its retaining walls had been abandoned because of foundation problems and the fact that it would come too close to a fine stand of trees. Vine covered pergolas at the sides of the street facade would screen parked cars. The building itself would be reminiscent of the native architecture of Bahrain and constructed of block bearing walls covered with an acrylic base stucco.

Mr. Stone was pleased to hear that the requirements of the master plan had been re-studied, but was still concerned about the overall effect of this group of "architectural display cases" as viewed from the street. Mr. Downes agreed this could be a problem, but also noted that the sites are very tight and difficult to work with. Mr. Stone thought the use of a common street tree would help unify the various chanceries and give a sense of continuity. Mr. Coppola agreed and said that the willow oak had been recommended as an effective tree for this purpose.

Other than the site and landscape concerns mentioned, there was no objection to the project and it was approved with the request that a material sample be submitted along with the working drawings for final review.

B. Department of the Navy

SEE EXHIBIT A

1. Chesapeake Division: Isaac Hull Gate, Washington Navy Yard. The Assistant Secretary reviewed jurisdiction in the Navy Yard, pointing out the western area under control of GSA, and the eastern area, including the historic district, under the Navy's jurisdiction. This submission was for a new heavy vehicle gate and separate pedestrian entrance to be cut into an existing brick wall. Mr. Frank Gerlak, representing the Navy, said this new entrance would relieve the historic Latrobe gate of traffic congestion and allow it to become primarily a ceremonial gate, although still open to vehicles. The new pedestrian gate would provide easy access to the Metro stop. The drawings showed simple entrance gates and a guardhouse placed well back from the M Street entrance. There was no objection to the concept or the design and the project was approved.

SEE EXHIBIT B

2. Chesapeake Division: Military vehicle parking area, Armed Forces Reserve complex, Anacostia Headquarters, Naval District Building. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this submission for a parking facility and pointed out the proposed location on a map. There was no objection to building the facility, but the Chairman

stressed that, since many of the vehicles will be rather large, particular care should be taken to see that the lot is well screened with shrubs and trees. He suggested to Mr. Gerlak that he work with the staff on this, and the project was approved.

C. Office of Personnel Management (formerly Civil Service Commission).

1. Proposed seal design. The Secretary showed a preliminary design which consisted of a wheel-like arrangement of heads in profile. He noted that the placement of the lettering had not yet been worked out. There was no objection to the face motif, and authority was delegated to the Chairman to work with representatives of the agency to complete the design.

D. District of Columbia Government, Department of General Services.

1. Material samples for previously approved Civic Center, Mount Vernon Square. The Assistant Secretary reviewed the Commission's approval of the preliminary design for this building and the request that alternatives to the precast panels originally suggested be explored. He introduced Charles Pavlick from the District Government who said that the architect, Welton Becket, and others have made studies of various materials since the Commission's request. He called on Mr. Robert Henry from the architect's office to report on the results. Mr. Henry first pointed out two changes that have been made in the building since the Commission last reviewed it: it has been extended to the east 30 feet, and the entrance on 11th and H Streets has been altered somewhat by the use of more glass. Mr. Henry then discussed possible material choices, reporting that studies had determined that metal coverings are too expensive, and that glass, also expensive, is not opaque enough to serve well for the exhibit areas and would need frequent washing. He said that they had come back to precast as the best choice because it is within the very limited budget and can be given surface interest which will avoid the monotony the members feared in such large wall expanses. He noted also that insulation can be built into the panels and that they can be painted on the inside and thus serve as a finished wall surface. His associate, Peter Gorman, showed samples of a very light colored precast panel, vertically grooved to give some surface interest, as well as metal siding in a similar color which will cover the mechanical equipment, and tinted glass in a light grey shade for the window areas. Window frames would be a dark colored metal. The members thought that, given the budget, these materials would be acceptable, and they were approved, subject to a final review of the colors of the various components.

SEE EXHIBIT C

E. District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development.

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 79-68, 69, 70: 2425 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Three proposed signs, McLaughlen National Bank. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this request for three additional signs on an existing bank; one to be on the grass in front of the building and the other two mounted on the wall, on either side of the drive-in teller's window. He reported that this would bring the number of signs on the bank to nine, and added that the residents of the building in which the bank is located, as well as those living in the surrounding area, are disturbed at the prospect. He introduced Mr. Alfred Cattrell, president of the Foggy Bottom Citizens' Association, who said the citizens feel that there are already too many signs on this small neighborhood bank. They fear that if the request is granted, other commercial owners in the area will also want additional signs. The members agreed with this position and recommended that just one new wall mounted sign replace an existing one; the sign proposed for the lawn was not approved.

b. S.L. 79-78, 79: 2500 Calvert Street, N.W. New residential complex on Shoreham Americana grounds, demolition of existing hotel addition. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this request for demolition of the motel addition to the hotel, built in the 1950's, and the erection of a new residential addition in its place. (The original hotel was built in 1930; the architect was J. Abel.) He introduced Mr. David Childs, from the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, who then introduced the new hotel owner, William Zeckendorf. Mr. Zeckendorf related that he has formed a partnership with a hotel firm from India in this venture; their plans include upgrading the present hotel as well as building the new addition. He explained that they plan to preserve the fine, large public spaces, actually reduce the number of hotel rooms, and add several new restaurants.

Mr. Childs then discussed the design of the residential addition, at present in a very preliminary stage. He showed photographs of the site, noting that the hotel is hardly visible from Rock Creek Parkway because of the tree cover. He also pointed out the steep ravine behind, where the new addition will be sited, extending the terraces of the hotel. The addition, too, will be mostly hidden from view by the dense tree cover. A subterranean entrance from 28th Street would reduce the impact of the development on the park. The building itself, containing 263 units and 700,000 square feet of space, would present a modulated, fractured silhouette towards the park, and will, perhaps, reflect the materials and details used in the original hotel.

There was no objection to the demolition of the motel, and approval was given to the general concept of the new residential addition.

c. S.L. 79-80, 1919 F Street, N.W. New office building for the World Bank. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this resubmission, which had been seen some time ago in a preliminary version. Since that time, the two early 19th century Lenthall houses on the site have been moved and a row of town houses on G Street demolished. The Alexander Ray house (F Street Club) remains on its site at 20th and F Streets, as does Concordia Church at 20th and G Streets.

Architect Vlastimil Koubek described the new building. With the approval of the Zoning Commission, it will rise to a height of 130 feet at the eastern boundary (19th Street), reflecting similar heights in the commercial district to the east. This height will continue westward for 120 feet, after which it will drop to 60 feet for the remainder of the site, thus keeping this western section closer in scale to the older townhouses still characteristic of this university area.

Mr. Diehl of the George Washington University commented on the new design and noted that Concordia Church is now a landmark and is, therefore, likely to remain. Mr. Ben Jacobs from the World Bank, the organization which will lease the building from the university, said that retail space will be provided along the F and G Street frontages, and also reported that there will be public access on G Street to a 200 seat auditorium.

Mr. Koubek pointed out that this is a new design, not the one seen previously by the Commission. There is no longer an entrance at G and 19th Streets; as there are now two cores in the building, the entrance falls more naturally in the center of the 19th Street facade. Mr. Koubek then introduced Mr. Pietro Belluschi, his consultant on this project, who commented on the more human scale of this design as opposed to the original version. He admitted that it is still a very large building, reflecting the problem of housing large institutions in Washington. He pointed out, also, the use of setbacks and screens to cope with the energy problem. Mr. Koubek noted that the arcaded ground floor space extends not only under the building but also out into public space to provide shade. Hideo Sasaki, landscape architect, then discussed the planting around the building and the garden for the F Street Club.

The Chairman questioned bringing the high-rise section of the building right out to the property line, observing that it gave the illusion that the building was tipping in that direction. He recalled the Lever House building in New York, where the tower is set back just far enough to avoid this effect. Mr. Koubek and Mr. Belluschi said they were aware of this but had not been able to make a setback work with the plan of the interior spaces or with the courtyard. Mr. Sasaki said that visually it was not successful either, as it gave the building a motel-like appearance.

The Chairman and the other members agreed that moving the high-rise section would probably create more problems than it solved; the preliminary design was therefore approved, with the Chairman noting that the break in the high-rise section at the 60 foot height deserved careful study.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 79-113, 3045 K Street, N.W. Reconsider razing building under provisions of D.C. Historic Preservation and Historic District Act of 1978. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this project, recalling that the Commission had seen two quite different buildings for the site--a design center and an apartment building--and had disapproved both designs. At the same time the recommendation was made that the early 19th century front portions (approximately 40 feet deep) of the two attached buildings on the site be retained in any future scheme. Ms. Anne Vytlacil of the Georgetown Board reported the results of that body's review of the project on 18 June 1979. She said that although there had been some discussion of the possibility of relocating the buildings, the Board's first choice continued to be the retention of the front portions and the erection of the new buildings around them, thus breaking up the mass.

The Assistant Secretary told the members that the only reason the project was before them at this time was because of a technicality which requires that a new decision be made under the recently passed D.C. Historic Preservation Act. The members voted to reaffirm their previous decision to oppose the total demolition of the two small buildings on the site.

b. O.G. 79-117, 2831 M Street, N.W. Proposed demolition of fire damaged gas station.

c. O.G. 79-118, 2831 M Street, N.W. Proposed new office/apartment/retail building.

The Assistant Secretary showed photos of the gas station proposed for demolition, and as it has no architectural or historical significance, the members had no objection to razing it. He then described its proposed replacement, a mixed-use building with an English basement for commercial use, first and second floors devoted to office space, and two floors of apartments above. Underground parking would be provided. Located on a corner site, the building would be adjacent to the simple, light-colored classic revival Biograph Theatre building to the east, with a pseudo-Colonial red brick bank across 29th Street to the west.

Architect Isaiah Martin described his building. It would feature a number of "special elements," including a large classical column and entablature at the commercial entrance on M Street. Drawings showed

the same column repeated at half scale at the corner, with the building cut back at the first floor level, reminiscent of the corner store entrances common in nineteenth century commercial buildings. Adjacent to the entrance on M Street was a large, reverse L shaped shop window, divided into many small lights. The roof on M Street re-called the Federal type with gables and dormers. Entrance to the residential floors would be from 29th Street through what the architect described as a classic doorway, based on those seen frequently in Georgetown. The roof on this elevation would be of the barn or shed type.

Ms. Vytlacil said the Georgetown Board had reservations about these "special elements" and had asked that they be restudied. Mr. Grosvenor Chapman, representing the Citizens' Association, thought the building completely irrational and not at all typical of Georgetown. He said it would not be acceptable to the community.

The Chairman was not strongly opposed to it, but agreed that the large show window was not right and thought the corner column and eccentric roofline on 29th Street needed rethinking. Mr. Nichols felt that too many statements were being made, and in addition to the other elements already criticized, found the entire 29th Street elevation very awkward. The Chairman suggested that, after turning the corner, the building should revert to the typical Georgetown street facade. It was generally agreed that the project needed more study and it was not approved.

d. O.G. 79-121, 1232 31st Street, N.W. Building renovation, confirmation of permit approval as required by the D.C. Historic Preservation and Historic District Act of 1978. As in the case of the project at 3045 K Street, N.W., this was submitted as a technicality, so that the Commission could comment on or reaffirm its previous action under the new Historic Preservation Act. After being assured that the drawings were identical to those approved under O.G. 79-90, the previous action was reaffirmed. Questions were raised by tenants of Hamilton Arms, but they were informed that the specific items questioned did not come under Commission of Fine Arts jurisdiction and had been dealt with by the agencies concerned.

e. O.G. 79-126, 3277 M Street, N.W. New residential/retail complex, revisions to approved designs. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this project for a mixed-use development which had received preliminary approval from the Commission previously. He recalled changes which had been made to make the design more acceptable to residents of the small townhouses in the area, and efforts by the Georgetown Board and the Commission to keep the height down. The project was resubmitted at this meeting with a request that additional height be allowed, to compensate for the inability to excavate as deeply as had been planned. The Assistant Secretary showed drawings made by the staff outlining the additional height requested. The architect showed his own drawings, which differed from those made by the staff, as far as the effect of the height increase was concerned. The drawings also showed some changes in plan.

Ms. Vytlacil said that while some of the drawings had not yet been seen by the Georgetown Board, their reaction to what they had seen was that both mass and detail had changed significantly, and they had recommended specifically that one floor be removed from the building facing M Street.

Mr. Chapman asked to comment and said he found it incredible that such changes would be requested and felt it was the architect's responsibility to investigate the foundation conditions thoroughly before proceeding this far. He said the Citizens' Association was absolutely opposed to any additional height.

Mr. Gitlin, the architect, said some soil borings had been taken, but it was later determined that they were not completely accurate; he also noted that he had been denied the right to underpin by some of the owners of adjacent property and was afraid to blast because of the possibility of damage to existing houses. When asked about the zoning change which now limits the height to 50 feet for his site, Mr. Gitlin said he was not requesting any changes which would bring the height above that.

Mr. Nichols thought the project was right back to where it had started, it was his feeling that the architect would just have to reconcile himself to having only three floors. It was noted also that the roofs had been flattened to gain more space under the new zoning rule, a change which resulted in a less attractive silhouette. It was suggested that a new design be worked out and presented to the Georgetown Board. The changes were not approved.

f. Appendix 1, approved.

III. LEGISLATION

A. S.J. Resolution No. 64. To authorize the U.S. Navy Memorial Foundation to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or Potomac River environs. The Secretary reported that this memorial would very likely take the form of a bandshell. He noted that there are already two Navy memorials in Washington--the Peace Monument at the foot of Capitol Hill, and the Navy and Marine ("Seagull") Memorial on Lady Bird Johnson Island. The members thought that a third, useful, memorial such as a bandstand would not be excessive, especially if it were to be located somewhere in the PADC area, as has been suggested. Mr. Stone was concerned that the memorial be well designed, and thought that perhaps the Commission could aid the Navy in getting a competent designer; or, if it is to be in the PADC area, perhaps this group might be able to suggest someone. While it was agreed that some guidance in the selection of an artist would be desirable, both the Chairman and the Secretary agreed that this would be a risky activity for the Commission to undertake, as it could lead to diminished objectivity during the review process.

SEE EXHIBIT D

B. S.J. Resolution No. 83. To authorize the Campfire Girls of Cundys Harbor, Maine, to erect a memorial on Maine Avenue in the District of Columbia. The Secretary reported that Senator Margaret Chase Smith had attempted to have this statue of a Maine Lobsterman erected on Maine Avenue in the mid-1960's, but was not successful at the time as the Commission thought there were already more than enough statues in the city. At this time, the members thought that the statue, small in size, would not be objectionable in one of the small park areas along the avenue and it was approved.

SEE EXHIBIT 1, 2 E

C. S. 461, "The Architectural Excellence Act of 1979." To require that competitions be conducted to enhance the Nation's architecture and determine the design of certain new Federal office buildings. Report requested by the Office of Management and Budget. The Secretary reported that GSA, while conceding the value of limited competitions, is very much opposed to this legislation, which would require a competition to determine the architect for every building costing over $25 million. The Chairman agreed that there are serious pros and cons on the subject of competitions, but felt that on the whole the idea was a good one. Mr. Stone thought that since it would apply only to major projects, it would attract the better firms in the country. It was felt that the opinion of Mr. Roche, who was absent, should be requested, but that the letter to be written could state a more or less favorable reaction.

SEE EXHIBIT F

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton,
Secretary

EXHIBIT A

27 July 1979

Dear Mr. Edgins:

The Commission of Fine Arts met with Mr. George Sealy from the Office of Protocol, Department of State, and Mr. Gregory Downes from the TAC architectural firm designing the Chancery of Bahrain at our meeting on July 24, 1979.

In approving the designs, the Commission recommended that working drawings and actual stucco samples be submitted as ready. We further hope that coordination in terms of the overall landscape and master plan will be a continuing consideration, and that the architects for the chanceries of Kuwait and Jordan join in this effort to insure landscape and grading coordination between projects.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Jim Edgins
Director
International Chancery
Center Project
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

CFA:DBMyer:CHAtherton:bb:7/27/79

EXHIBIT B

July 27, 1979

Dear Commander Beuby:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to meet with Mr. Gerlach of your office on July 24th, and to approve proposals for the Isaac Hull Gate at the Washington Navy Yard and the Military Vehicle Parking Area, Armed Forces Reserve Complex, Anacostia Headquarters. Though the designs of both proposals are appropriate, we hope that adequate landscaping to enhance the gate and screen the parking lot would be a specified part of the actual construction contract. The prominence and visibility of both sites justifies the extra effort in the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Commander S. C. Beuby
United States Navy
Head, Planning Department
Department of the Navy
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering
Command
Building 57
Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20374

EXHIBIT C

July 27, 1979

Dear Mr. Pavlick:

The Commission of Fine Arts was glad to meet with you and your consultants on the Civic Center at its meeting on July 24, 1979. We appreciate the efforts at studying alternative exterior materials for the center, and feel that the proposals for a light smooth precast concrete can be approved pending your final selection. If a cooler tonality precast turns out to be unachievable the other materials we feel should blend with the precast, rather than the reverse. As the architects continue their further studies, the Commission and its Staff are glad to assist in any way we can with a project of such major public importance.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Charles R. Pavlick
Architect-Engineer
Liaison Officer
Government of the District
of Columbia
Department of General Services
613 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

CHA/Myer/ko/7-27-79

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN — FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY — KEVIN ROCHE
LEE B. JACOBS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

26 July 1979

Dear Senator Jackson:

I am writing in reply to your letter of July 20, 1979 requesting the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on S. J. Res. 64, a bill which would authorize the U. S. Navy Memorial Foundation to erect a memorial in Washington or immediately across the Potomac on Park lands.

The Commission discussed this legislation at its meeting on July 24, 1979, and has no objection to its enactment.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Henry M. Jackson
United States Senate
Committee on Energy
and Natural Resources
Washington, D.C. 20510

EXHIBIT E 1

24 July 1979

Dear Senator Pell:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on July 24, 1979, considered your request for comments on S.J. Res. 83, a bill to authorize the Campfire Girls of Cundys Harbor, Maine to erect a Memorial on Maine Avenue in the District of Columbia.

The Commission has no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Claiborne Pell
United States Senate
Committee on Rules
and Administration
Washington, D.C. 20510

CFA:CHAtherton:bb:7/24/79

EXHIBIT E 2

August 3, 1979

Dear Mr. Nedzi:

I am writing in reply to your letter of July 6, 1979 requesting the comments of the Commission of Fine Arts on H.R. 4[illegible]4, a bill authorizing the erection of a statue entitled "The Maine Lobsterman," on Maine Avenue in Washington, D.C.

The Commission considered the Senate version of the bill at its meeting on July 4, 1979, and had no objection. Since the House Bill actually names an existing statue to be erected on Maine Avenue, and since we have not had an opportunity to actually inspect the sculpture, the Commission would like to reserve final judgment on the statue as to whether it would be a suitable addition to the Maine Avenue waterfront.

If you can send send us some photographs of the work or tell us where we can see it, we would be happy to send on additional comments at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Lucien N. Nedzi
U.S. House of Representatives
Rayburn House Office Building
Room 418
Washington, D.C. 20515

CA:hg

EXHIBIT F

10 August 1979

Dear Mr. Martin:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on 24 July 1979 reviewed the draft report prepared by the General Services Administration on S. 461, "The Architectural Excellence Bill," which you asked us to comment upon in your letter of 19 July 1979.

The Commission disagrees with the position taken by GSA in its draft report. It is contrary to the aims of an Administration which has gone to considerable lengths to emphasize the need for design excellence in all aspects of the public sector, including federal architecture, interior design, landscape architecture, and the graphic arts. One of the best ways to insure excellence is to solicit solutions to design problems from the widest possible arena of design professionals.

In the early years of the republic, competitions were held for our most important public buildings, such as the White House, Capitol, and the Boston Customs House. It was not until after the Civil War that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and his staff began to assume major responsibility for the design of government buildings. This practice persisted well into the twentieth century, in spite of the passage of the Tarsney Act in 1893, which attempted to place the design of major buildings, taken under the control of the Treasury Department, into the hands of private architects chosen by competition.

In recent years there has been a deliberate shift away from the use of staff architects and toward the securing of architectural services from the private sector through competitive entry or modified competitions based on past performance. While this has been a step in the right direction, the new approach still has its limitations, since commissions are often awarded to architectural firms not on the basis of proven design capabilities, but for other reasons.

...2/

It is easy to see why the General Services Administration would rather commission architects directly. No doubt the process of selecting an architect through competition is more time consuming and entails additional expenditures. Also the possibility of selecting an architect who is relatively obscure and untested gives rise to a certain hesitancy on the part of federal administrators who naturally would rather work with a known quantity, someone with a record of being reasonably competent, a good business person and one who can produce a reliable if undistinguished product within the financial and time constraints of the contract. All of this is understandable.

There is no reason, however, why the selection process through competition cannot include all of these desirable factors. If, for example, a winning design happens to be by a person who lacks the experience the federal government feels is necessary before entering into an agreement involving millions of dollars, there is no reason why a joint venture cannot be arranged between the winning designer and a more experienced firm with production and management capabilities. Thus the public would benefit from the highest and best use of professional services that can be brought to the service of the government. As a matter of fact many of the best architectural firms themselves are organized on such a basis, where there is a balance between excellent designers and production and management personnel within a single office, so there would be nothing unusual for such an arrangement on a broader basis involving two or more parties.

The report by GSA also expresses the fear that the government would be bound to accept the rulings of a jury on a design that might have been chosen for aesthetic reasons alone but which might prove impractical or present functional problems of one sort or another.

We believe such fears are either exaggerated or unfounded.

First of all, juries for competitions of this magnitude and importance would by necessity be very carefully selected and they would be charged to choose the design which on balance was superior in every respect. Secondly, the competition entries are usually screened by a professional advisor who has the authority to eliminate any entrant who does not satisfy certain basic stipulations in the program. Thirdly, and most important, the competition itself should be for the selection of the architect, not for a specific design. This can be made clear in the terms of the competition rules. Obviously no client should be bound to a specific design solution with no opportunity for comment or change apart from the

...3/

initial program requirements. Taken together, these elements of the competition process should afford ample opportunity to assure the selection of the best architect and, eventually, the best overall design solution.

In conclusion, the Commission of Fine Arts believes the opportunity for design excellence in the federal government will be greatly enhanced by the provisions of the proposed legislation. Competitions have proven their public worth in other countries for many years. There is no reason why the same should not be true for our own government. In fact, the architectural competition should be a truer expression of our society as a way of securing and rewarding excellence. It is not only a proper form of selection for design professionals, it is in the best public interest. It is, in our judgement, long overdue.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Bernard H. Martin
Office of the Assistant Director
for Legislative Reference
Executive Office of the President
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

CHAtherton:bb:8/10/79